

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

PCT

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing
(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

Applicant's or agent's file reference
see form PCT/ISA/220

FOR FURTHER ACTION
See paragraph 2 below

International application No.
PCT/JP2004/004329

International filing date (day/month/year)
26.03.2004

Priority date (day/month/year)
27.03.2003

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC
B05D1/32, B05B13/04, B05B1/14

Applicant
HONDA MOTOR CO., LTD.

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☒ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office - P.B. 5818 Patentlaan 2
NL-2280 HV Rijswijk - Pays Bas
Tel. +31 70 340 - 2040 Tx: 31 651 epo nl.
Fax: +31 70 340 - 3016

Authorized Officer

Brévier, F

Telephone No. +31 70 340-2816



WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITYInternational application No.
PCT/JP2004/004329

Box No. 1 Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material:
☐ a sequence listing
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material:
☐ in written format
☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing:
☐ contained in the international application as filed.
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/JP2004/004329

Box No. II Priority

1. ☒ The following document has not been furnished:

☒ copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43*bis*.1 and 66.7(a)).

☐ translation of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43*bis*.1 and 66.7(b)).

Consequently it has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.

2. ☐ This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.

3. Additional observations, if necessary:

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43*bis*.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims	5, 6, 8-10, 16, 19
	No: Claims	1-4, 7, 11-15, 17, 18, 20
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	5, 6, 8, 9
	No: Claims	1-4, 7, 10-20
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	1-20
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

Re Item V.

- 1 The following documents are referred to in this communication:
D1 : DE 199 36 790 A (NORDSON CORP WESTLAKE) 15 February 2001
D2 : DE 198 54 760 A (AUDI NSU AUTO UNION AG) 31 May 2000
D3 : US 5 645 895 A (IIYAMA KAZUTO ET AL) 8 July 1997
D4 : PATENT ABSTRACTS OF JAPAN vol. 2000, no. 21, 3 August 2001
(2001-08-03) & JP 2001 089697 A (RINREI:KK; HONDA MOTOR CO LTD),
3 April 2001 (2001-04-03)

INDEPENDENT CLAIMS 1 AND 11

- 2 The subject-matter of claims 1 and 11 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT; and therefore the criteria of Article 33(2) PCT are not met.
 - 2.1 Document D1 discloses (see the passages quoted in the search report):
A method of forming a protective layer, comprising the steps of:
applying liquid material to an object from a sprayer mechanism of a coating device; and
drying said liquid material to form a peelable protective layer,
wherein said sprayer mechanism sprays said liquid material such that said liquid material is distributed locally at a position close to an edge of said object, and distributed widely at a position away from said edge of said object.
 - 2.2 As can be seen from the above, document D1 discloses in combination all the features defined in independent claim 1. Hence the subject-matter of this claim is not new (Article 33(2) PCT).
 - 2.3 Furthermore document D1 also discloses in combination all the features defined in independent claim 11 (see the passages quoted in the search report). Hence the subject-matter of this claim is not new (Article 33(2) PCT).
- 3 The reasoning of points 2.1 to 2.3 hereabove applies equally to the document D2 (see the passages of D2 quoted in the search report).

DEPENDENT CLAIMS

4.1 Dependent claims 2-4, 7, 12-15, 17, 18, 20 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of novelty (Article 33(2) PCT) (see the passages of D1 and D2 quoted in the search report).

4.2 Dependent claims 10, 16, 19 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of inventive step (Article 33(3) PCT) for the following reasons:

Claim 10:

It is well known practice to use a peelable coating comprising an acrylic copolymer as a main component (e.g. see D4).

Claim 16:

The terms "large" and "small" used in claim 16 are so vague that they can be interpreted in a very broad way, whereby they do not clearly define any technical features relating to the intervals between the middle sprayers.

Therefore, the only additional feature of claim 16 is the multiplicity of middle sprayers, which is a well known practice in the field of spraying with robots (e.g. see D3).

Claim 19:

A similar reasoning applies to claim 19 where the features relating to the "pressure" in the multiple middle sprayers relate to a method of use of the apparatus and do not clearly define further the apparatus in terms of its technical features.

4.3 The combinations of the features of dependent claims 5, 6, 8, 9 are new and inventive since they are neither known from, nor rendered obvious by, the cited prior art.